arXiv:cond-mat/0009099v1 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 7 Sep 2000

Time reparametrization group and the long time behaviour in quantum glassy systems

Malcolm P. Kennett^{a,*} and Claudio Chamon^{b,†}
^{a} *Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544*
^{b} *Department of Physics, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215*
(February 1, 2008)

We study the long time dynamics of a quantum version of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model. Time reparameterizations of the dynamical equations have a parallel with renormalization group transformations, and within this language the long time behaviour of this model is controlled by a reparameterization group (R$_p$G) fixed point of the classical dynamics. The irrelevance of the quantum terms in the dynamical equations in the aging regime explains the classical nature of the violation of the fluctuation-dissipation theorem.

PACS: 75.10.Nr, 75.10.Jm, 75.10.Hk, 05.30.-d

There has been considerable interest lately in quantum systems that show glassiness. A number of experiments [1–3] have studied the effect of quantum fluctuations on spin systems which are close to a quantum phase transition between a spin glass and a quantum-disordered (paramagnetic) phase. Theoretically, one approach to the problem has been to add quantum fluctuations to a classical model, such as by applying a transverse field to the Ising model [4,5], or by giving quantum dynamics to classical spin variables [6–8]. These models are more amenable to analytical treatment than the full $SU(2)$ quantum spin systems [9].

Quantum fluctuations have been shown to be responsible for redefining the boundary between the spin glass and the quantum disordered phases in systems such as quantum rotors or the transverse field Ising model. In principle they could also alter the non-equilibrium dynamics in the glassy regime at very low temperatures. Whilst the properties in both the quantum critical and quantum disordered regions for these systems can be understood within a static formulation [6], studying the non-equilibrium effects in the glassy region requires a quantum dynamical approach.

In classical spin glasses the out of equilibrium nature of the system is manifest through a persistent dependence of susceptibilities on the time elapsed since the system entered the glassy phase. Much progress has been achieved in recent years in understanding these aging effects in classical spin glasses [10], and only very recently have these issues begun to be addressed in quantum systems. Cugliandolo and Lozano [8] studied a quantum version of the p-spin model, and in this paper we study the long-time dynamics of the quantum version of the soft-spin Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) model [11].

It was established in Ref. [8] that quantum effects are manifest even in the long-time "aging" regime of the glassy phase, contrary to the naive expection that quantum fluctuations enter only the short-time dynamics. However, the *form* of the violation of the Fluctuation Dissipation Theorem (FDT) – a hallmark of the aging dynamics – coincided with that of *classical* spin glass models.

One anticipates a classical limiting form for the FDT violation, because the low frequency limit of the quantum fluctuation dissipation theorem (QFDT) [8] coincides with the $\hbar \to 0$ limit for an equilibrium bosonic system. The aging regime is non-equilibrium; however one expects intuitively that there is a similar situation in which quantum effects are "irrelevant" in modifying the form of the violation of the FDT.

To make these ideas more precise, we develop a general framework which allows us to show that quantum terms in the dynamical equations are *irrelevant* under a group of time reparametrization transformations that we define below. The long-time dynamical equations, even though they contain terms purely quantum in origin, are controlled by the classical R$_p$G *fixed point* dynamical equations. Hence, when quantum dynamics are imposed on a classical model, the form of the violation of the FDT must coincide with that of the classical version of the model. Quantum effects renormalize the coefficients in the fixed point dynamical equations, changing the details (*e.g.* effective temperature) but not the form of the violation of the FDT. We make these ideas concrete in our solution of the quantum version of the soft-spin SK model.

Intentionally using language that parallels the Renormalization Group (RG) terminology, let us proceed by introducing the R$_p$G transformations as a tool to discuss the fixed point equations of the long time dynamics. However, R$_p$G transformations are weaker than the RG in the sense that they act only on the correlators and dynamical equations and not on the action. Consider a general transformation of the time coordinates

$$t \to \tilde{t} = h(t) \ , \tag{1}$$

for a differentiable function $h(t)$ with $dh/dt \geq 1$ (so as to stretch time). Given a two-time correlation function $G(t_1, t_2)$, we define a transformation $G \to \tilde{G}$ such that

$$\tilde{G}(t_1, t_2) = \left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial t_1}\right)^{\Delta_1^G} \left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial t_2}\right)^{\Delta_2^G} G(\, h(t_1), h(t_2)\,) \ , \tag{2}$$

where $\Delta_{1,2}^G$ are the scaling dimensions of the correlator

G under the rescaling of the time coordinates $t_{1,2}$. We term Δ_1^G and Δ_2^G the advanced and retarded scaling dimensions respectively.

The non-equilibrium dynamics is governed by a set of integro-differential equations for a set of correlators $\{G_\alpha\}$. We represent this set of equations as $H[\{G_\alpha\}] = 0$.

Define a fixed point of the reparametrization transformation $h(t)$ as H_0 such that if the $\{G_\alpha\}$ satisfy $H_0[\{G_\alpha\}] = 0$, then $H_0[\{\tilde{G}_\alpha\}] = 0$ is satisfied as well. We also write this as an equivalence $H_0 \equiv \tilde{H}_0$.

Let us examine the general case when the set of equations H is not a fixed point of the reparametrization. Consider the situation when the equations H can be written as an R$_p$G invariant part H_0 plus a non-invariant perturbation δH:

$$H[\{G_\alpha\}] \equiv H_0[\{G_\alpha\}] + \delta H[\{G_\alpha\}] = 0. \tag{3}$$

The transformed equations satisfy $\tilde{H} \equiv H_0 + \delta\tilde{H}$, and $\delta H[\{\tilde{G}_\alpha\}] \not\equiv \delta\tilde{H}[\{\tilde{G}_\alpha\}]$, so $\tilde{H}[\{\tilde{G}_\alpha\}] \neq 0$.

If the transformed set of equations $\delta\tilde{H}[\{\tilde{G}_\alpha\}] \to 0$ under repeated coordinate transformations, then the perturbation δH is irrelevant under time reparametrizations. This framework allows us to determine which terms in the dynamical equations of quantum glasses will be important in the long time limit.

We apply these ideas to a soft spin version of the SK model [12]. We use a closed time path (CTP) formalism (Schwinger-Keldysh) [13,14], which obviates the need for replicas in performing an average over quenched disorder [8,15] for arbitrary initial conditions. The action S has a free part S_0, a part due to self-interactions S_u, a part due to disorder S_{dis}, and a part due to the interaction with a thermal bath S_T [16]. We write the Lagrangians for the free part and self interactions as

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \sum_{i,a,b} \left[\frac{1}{2g} (\partial_t S_i^a) \sigma_3^{ab} (\partial_t S_i^b) + \frac{1}{2} m^2 (S_i^a) \sigma_3^{ab} (S_i^b) \right] , \tag{4}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_u = \sum_{i,a,b} \frac{u}{2} \left\{ \left[(S_i^1)^2 \right]^2 - \left[(S_i^2)^2 \right]^2 \right\} , \tag{5}$$

where i, j are site indices and a, b are Keldysh contour indices. The couplings are g, m^2 and u, and σ_3 is the Pauli matrix that acts on the two-component fields on the time-ordered and anti-time-ordered branches of the Keldysh contour. This quantum SK model is the $M = 1$ version of the quantum rotor model considered in Ref. [6]. The spin exchange interactions are infinite ranged and are described by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{dis}} = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} S_i^a \sigma_3^{ab} S_j^b, \tag{6}$$

where the J_{ij}s are assumed to have a Gaussian distribution, with $\overline{J_{ij}^2} = J/N$, where N is the number of sites and the sum is over $i \neq j$. We use an overbar $\overline{\cdots}$ to indicate an average over disorder realizations and angled brackets $< \ldots >$ to indicate an average with respect to $\mathcal{L}$. The thermal part of the action (obtained after integrating out heat bath variables) is

$$S_T = \int_0^\infty dt_1 \int_0^\infty dt_2 \sum_{i,a,b} S_i^a(t_1) \left\{ i\nu(t_1 - t_2)[\delta^{ab} - \sigma_1^{ab}] - \eta(t_1 - t_2)[\sigma_1^{ab} + i\sigma_2^{ab}] \right\} S_i^b(t_2), \tag{7}$$

where η and ν are the same heat bath kernels for noise and dissipation that are described in Ref. [8]. We write the generating functional for the action in the CTP formalism and average over disorder then decouple the four spin term with a Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation.

We define the correlation $C(t_1, t_2)$ and response $R(t_1, t_2)$ for times t_1 and t_2 after the initial quench as

$$C_{ij}(t_1, t_2) = \frac{1}{2} \overline{\langle S_i^1(t_1) S_j^1(t_2) + S_i^2(t_1) S_j^2(t_2) \rangle}, \tag{8}$$

and $R_{ij}(t_1, t_2) = \delta/\delta h_j(t_2) \overline{\langle S_i^1(t_1) \rangle}$, which in linear response theory may be written as

$$R_{ij}(t_1, t_2) = \frac{i}{\hbar} \overline{\langle S_i^1(t_1) [S_j^1(t_2) - S_j^2(t_2)] \rangle} . \tag{9}$$

We use a saddle point evaluation ($N \to \infty$) and expand to $O(u^2)$ to obtain mode coupling equations for C and R. We solve these equations in the stationary regime for the paramagnetic phase and the spin glass phase.

In the paramagnetic phase, the correlation functions are time translation invariant (TTI) once initial transients have decayed and we can Fourier transform them. The heat bath kernels η and ν satisfy the QFDT [8] if there is Ohmic dissipation, and this implies that the same is true for the correlation and response in the paramagnetic phase

$$C(\omega) = \frac{\hbar}{2} \coth\left(\frac{\beta\hbar\omega}{2} \right) [R(\omega) - A(\omega)] , \tag{10}$$

where $A(\omega)$ is the Fourier transform of the advanced response (R is the retarded response) and β is the inverse temperature. The correlators may be written as the sum of a stationary (TTI) piece and an aging piece

$$R(t_1, t_2) = R_{ST}(t_1 - t_2) + R_{AG}(t_1, t_2) , \tag{11}$$

$$C(t_1, t_2) = C_{ST}(t_1 - t_2) + C_{AG}(t_1, t_2) . \tag{12}$$

The stationary pieces decay on a much shorter timescale than the aging pieces, so only the aging pieces influence the long time dynamics. In the spin glass phase, we need to take into account the aging that has occurred up to the waiting time, and we find the expected zero frequency piece in the response, so that

$$R_{ST}(\omega) - A_{ST}(\omega) = \frac{2}{\hbar} \tanh\left(\frac{\beta\hbar\omega}{2} \right) C_{ST}(\omega) + \frac{4\pi\beta J^2}{(M\gamma_0)} q_{EA} \left(\chi_\infty + (RC)_\infty \right) \delta(\omega) , \tag{13}$$

where q_{EA} is the Edwards-Anderson order parameter, $M\gamma_0$ is the friction coefficient for the bath, $\chi_\infty = \lim_{t_1\to\infty}\int_0^{t_1} dt\, R_{ST}(t_1-t)$, and $(RC)_\infty$ is (noting that $t_1 \sim t_2 \gg |t_1-t_2|$ in the evaluation of the integral)

$$(RC)_\infty = \lim_{t_1\to\infty}\int_0^{t_1} dt\, R_{AG}(t_1,t)\left(C_{AG}(t,t_1)+C_{AG}(t_1,t)\right) . \tag{14}$$

We implement weak ergodicity breaking (WEB) and weak long term memory (WLTM) [17,18] in the integrals of correlation functions as described in Ref. [8] to obtain the dynamical equations in the aging regime for which $t_1 > t_2$ and both t_1 and t_2 become very large

$$H^R[C,R] = H_0^R[C,R] + \delta H^R[C,R] = 0\ , \tag{15}$$

$$H^C[C,R] = H_0^C[C,R] + \delta H^C[C,R] = 0\ , \tag{16}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^R[C,R] &= \lambda_1 R(t_1,t_2) + \lambda_2 C(t_1,t_2)^2 R(t_1,t_2) \\ &\quad + 2J^2\int_0^\infty dt\, R(t_1,t)R(t,t_2) \\ &\quad + \lambda_3\int_0^\infty dt\, C(t_1,t)^2 R(t_1,t)R(t,t_2)\ , \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta H^R[C,R] &= -\frac{1}{2g}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_1^2}R(t_1,t_2) - \frac{1}{3}\lambda_2\hbar^2 R(t_1,t_2)^3 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{3}\lambda_3\hbar^2\int_0^\infty dt\, R(t_1,t)^3 R(t,t_2)\ , \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^C[C,R] &= \lambda_1 C(t_1,t_2) + \frac{1}{3}\lambda_2 C(t_1,t_2)^3 \\ &\quad + 2J^2\int_0^\infty dt\, \left[C(t_1,t)R(t_2,t) + R(t_1,t)C(t,t_2)\right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{3}\lambda_3\int_0^\infty dt\, C(t_1,t)^3 R(t_2,t) \\ &\quad + \lambda_3\int_0^\infty dt\, C(t_1,t)^2 R(t_1,t)C(t,t_2)\ , \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta H^C[C,R] &= -\frac{1}{2g}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_1^2}C(t_1,t_2) + \lambda_4 R(t_1,t_2) \\ &\quad + \lambda_5 C(t_1,t_2)^2 R(t_1,t_2) - \frac{1}{3}\lambda_5\hbar^2 R(t_1,t_2)^3 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{9}\lambda_2\hbar^2 C(t_1,t_2)R(t_1,t_2)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{3}\lambda_3\hbar^2\int_0^\infty dt\, \big[R(t_1,t)^3 C(t,t_2) \\ &\qquad + 3R(t_1,t)^2 R(t_2,t)C(t_1,t)\big]\ . \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The coefficients $\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_5$ depend on $\hbar$, u, J, as well as temperature and couplings to the bath.

Let us now consider the time coordinate transformation defined in Eq. (1). Repeated application of R$_p$G transformations leads to the fixed point equations $H_0^R[C,R]=0$ and $H_0^C[C,R]=0$, if the C,R correlators are chosen to transform under Eq. (2) with dimensions $\Delta_{1,2}^C = 0$, $\Delta_1^R = 0$, and $\Delta_2^R = 1$ (suggested by the form of the FDT):

$$\tilde{C}(t_1,t_2) = C(\,h(t_1),\, h(t_2)\,)\ , \tag{21}$$

$$\tilde{R}(t_1,t_2) = \left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial t_2}\right) R(\,h(t_1),\, h(t_2)\,)\ . \tag{22}$$

The fixed point equations contain terms of the same form as considered in Ref. [19] in the dynamical solution of the *classical* SK model. These equations have a solution via the ansatz

$$R(t_1,t_2) = \beta X[C(t_1,t_2)]\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}C(t_1,t_2)\theta(t_1-t_2), \tag{23}$$

which is invariant under time reparametrization. Equation (23) is the modified version of the FDT (in the FDT, $X=1$). The term $X[C]$ is the FDT violation factor, which we calculate here for the model in question.

The quantum terms are irrelevant under the R$_p$G transformations, as are some of the classical terms. Hence, classical dynamics is recovered in the long time limit even when $\hbar \neq 0$. In Ref. [19] the asymptotic equations were obtained by ignoring terms such as time derivatives of the correlation and response, whereas here these terms are seen to be irrelevant under repeated application of a R$_p$G transformation.

A simple example which illustrates the idea of irrelevant terms, is to consider the reparametrization $h(t) = bt$, with $b > 1$. If we apply this transformation to the R^3 term in δH^C it is rescaled by b^{-3}, whereas $H_0^C \to H_0^C$. This term will clearly become negligible under repeated transformations.

We find the solution to equations (15) and (16) with the ansatz (23) to be similar to that found by [19]

$$X[C] = \frac{\lambda_2 C}{\beta}\frac{(2J^2+\lambda_3 q_{EA}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2J^2+\lambda_3 C^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \tag{24}$$

where for small q_{EA}, *i.e.* $\lambda_3 C^2 < \lambda_3 q_{EA}^2 \ll 2J^2$, we recover $X[C] = \lambda_2 C/(2J^2\beta)$.

In the solution above, $\lambda_3 = \frac{3}{2}u^2$, and quantum effects can only enter through the coupling $\lambda_2 = \frac{3}{2}u^2\chi_\infty$. Hence, in the fixed point dynamical equations (17) and (19), quantum effects enter only as renormalizations of the coefficients.

The picture we have of the dynamics of a quantum spin glass is that at short times the QFDT holds with a zero frequency correction, then at intermediate times, quantum fluctuations can still affect the dynamics in a significant way [8], but at longer times they become increasingly irrelevant. Finally, at very long times, R and C are related via the classical R$_p$G fixed point equation, although the matching conditions between this long time behaviour and the short time behaviour are also affected by quantum effects. It is in this sense that we call the long time dynamical equations with renormalized coefficients *renormalized classical*.

In the $\hbar \to 0$ limit, the CTP formalism becomes identical to the Martin-Siggia-Rose (MSR) [20] functional integral formalism [8]. However when $\hbar \neq 0$ the dynamics in each approach enter in very different ways – in the MSR approach, the dynamics are imposed on the system through a Langevin equation describing the interaction with the bath, but in the CTP formalism, the dynamics are intrinsic to the quantum spin variables. The reason that both approaches give the same long time dynamics is that the time derivatives and bath interactions are irrelevant under R_pG transformations in either case.

The time reparametrization invariance of the long time dynamics of the classical SK model was noticed by several authors [19,21]. The quantum dynamical contribution, as well as other classical and derivative terms that we discuss in this paper break that invariance. However, in the language of the R_pG, these terms are irrelevant. This suggests that R_pG invariance can be a guiding principle in understanding the long time behaviour of glassy systems. In particular, R_pG invariance could be the symmetry principle related to the modified FDT; the retarded and advanced scaling dimensions of C, R are tied by the form of the modified FDT, and *vice versa*, the form of the modified FDT is constrained by the scaling dimensions of the correlators C, R. Along these lines, it would be very interesting to look at different models that could lead to mode-coupling equations with alternative R_pG fixed points. These could possibly have more than two correlation functions, and could contain correlators with different scaling dimensions than in the usual classical models (and their quantum descendents). Most likely candidates are models with non-trivial spin algebras, such as the SU(2) spins for which a dynamical approach has very recently been developed [22], and the $SU(N)$ models [23].

We would like to thank Jinwu Ye for useful discussions and Leticia Cugliandolo and David Huse for clarifying discussions and careful reading of the manuscript. We also acknowledge the hospitality of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton (C. C), where this work was started, and of Boston University (M. P. K), where this work was completed. Support was provided by the NSF Grant DMR-98-76208, and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (C. C).

* Electronic address: mkennett@princeton.edu
† Electronic address chamon@bu.edu

---

[1] W. Wu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2076 (1991); J. Mattsson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1678 (1995); D. Bitko *et al., ibid.* **75**, 1679 (1995); R. Pirc, B. Tadic, and R. Blinc, Z. Phys. B **61**, 69 (1997).

[2] B. Keimer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1930 (1991); Phys. Rev. B **46**, 14034 (1992); S. M. Hayden *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 821 (1991); *ibid.* **67**, 3622 (1991).

[3] C. Broholm *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 3173 (1990).

[4] J. Miller and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 3147 (1993); M. J. Thill and D. A. Huse, Physica A **214**, 321 (1995); M. J. Rozenberg and D. R. Grempel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2550 (1998); O. Motrunich *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 1160 (2000).

[5] D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** 534 (1992); Phys. Rev. B **51**, 6411 (1995).

[6] J. Ye, S. Sachdev, and N. Read, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 4011 (1993); N. Read, S. Sachdev, and J. Ye, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 384 (1995).

[7] T. K. Kopec and K. D. Usadel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 1988 (1997).

[8] L. F. Cugliandolo and G. Lozano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4979 (1998); Phys. Rev. B **59**, 915 (1999).

[9] A. Bray and M. Moore, J. Phys. C **13**, L655 (1980); D. R. Grempel and M. J. Rozenberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 389 (1998).

[10] J. P. Bouchard, L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan, and M. Mézard, in *Spin Glasses and Random Fields* edited by A. P. Young (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998).

[11] D. Sherrington and S. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32**, 1792 (1975).

[12] M. P. Kennett and C. Chamon, (in preparation).

[13] J. Schwinger, J. Math. Phys. **2**, 407 (1961).

[14] L. V. Keldysh, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **47**, 1515 (1964) [Sov. Phys. JETP **20**, 1018 (1965)].

[15] C. Chamon, A. W. W. Ludwig, and C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 2239 (1999); A. Kamenev and A. Andreev, *ibid.* **60**, 2218 (1999).

[16] R. P. Feynman and F. L. Vernon, Ann. Phys. **24**, 118 (1963).

[17] J. P. Bouchaud, J. Phys. I (France) **2**, 1705 (1992).

[18] L. F. Cugliandolo and J. Kurchan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 173 (1993); Phil. Mag. B **71**, 501 (1995).

[19] L. F. Cugliandolo and J. Kurchan, J. Phys. A **27**, 5749 (1994); see also L. F. Cugliandolo and J. Kurchan, Physica A **263**, 242 (1999).

[20] P. C. Martin, E. D. Siggia, and H. A. Rose, Phys. Rev. A **8**, 423 (1973).

[21] H. Sompolinsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 935 (1981); H. Horner, Z. Phys. B **57**, 39 (1984); S. L. Ginzburg, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **90**, 754 (1986) [Sov. Phys. JETP **63**, 439 (1986)]; L. B. Ioffe, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 5181 (1988); V. S. Dotsenko, M. V. Feigel'man, and L. B. Ioffe, *Spin Glasses and related Problems (Soviet Scientific Reviews 15)* (New York: Harwood Academic, 1990).

[22] M. N. Kiselev and R. Oppermann, cond-mat/0008060.

[23] A. Georges, O. Parcollet, and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 840 (2000).